UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,577	04/26/2001	Robert James Lawson	13DV13821	7443

29399 7590 10/27/2003

JOHN S. BEULICK
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER	
PHAM, HUNG Q	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/842,577	Applicant(s) LAWSON ET AL.	
	Examiner HUNG Q PHAM	Art Unit 2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *17-20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-15 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a thorough search and examination of either claim group would be relevant to the examination of the other group. This is not found persuasive because the inventions I-III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. For example, group I (claims 1-15) is drawn to a method for providing access based on user profiles by creating user profile, electronic profile for data, establishing rule and method for accessing. Group II (claim 16) is drawn to a method of generating a database based on predetermined rules and criteria. Group III (claims 17-20) is drawn to a network system with a client system and a server system, which manages registration process, authorization process and maintenance process. However, examiner reconsiders group II (claim 16), which is drawn to a database providing access to users with Rule Based Access Guidelines. Thus, claim 16 is examined along with group I. Group III (claims 17-20) is withdrawn from further consideration and search. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: ***OHR Application and an RFCA Application***. They should be ***Oracle Human Resource Application and a Request For Computer Access Application***. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding to claim 5, the step of ***notifying the user of the decision within a pre-determined time frame*** was not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879].

Regarding to claim 1, Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the

network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 1, a profile compiling/updating object 32 may use the information received from user affinity determining object 30 to generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 2, lines 65-67) as the step of ***creating an electronic profile for a user within a centralized database.*** To prevent access to objects containing, for example, confidential or proprietary information, users may be assigned levels of access privileges. Access privileges may be, for example, read-only, edit, etc. Access privileges may be assigned by a system administrator and stored in an access control list or ACL (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 18-26) as the step of ***creating*** an ACL as ***an electronic profile for data within the centralized database.*** As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user. If, however, step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), step 162 determines whether the user has requested additional privileges from the system administrator. If additional privileges have not been requested, step 164 notifies the user that access has been denied. Otherwise, step 166 determines if additional privileges have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, step 168 updates the ACL and may proceed to retrieve and present the requested object using steps 158 and 160 respectively. If step 166 determines that additional privileges have

not been granted, the user may be notified that access has been denied using step 164 (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object of FIG. 3 as ***methodology is established for user access***. In order to grant access to a requested object or ***making a decision with reference to the user access***, access privileges in ACL and user profile are compared, and the procedure is processed as at step 158-166 to ***complete an evaluation based on the electronic profiles, and operating methodology in response to a request from the user for access***. Kraenzel does not explicitly teach ***pre-determined rules are established***, and ***the evaluation based on pre-determined rules***. Behera teaches a method to control access via properties system by providing ACL rules based on the properties associated with the entries (Behera, Col. 1, line 64-Col. 2, line 5). Behera further discloses the step of ***establishing pre-determined rules*** (Behera, Col. 4, lines 25-54) and ***evaluating the pre-determined rules*** to grant access to a user (Behera, Col. 6, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by applying the access rules to the ACL as taught by Behera in order to grant access to a user or a group to a particular attribute object in the database.

Regarding to claim 3, Kraenzel and Behera teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating data profiles based on at least one of Data Elements, Data Tags, Rules of Access, an Approver's Name for Each Rule of Access, Rules of Exclusion, an Exception List, and Field Tags*** (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-26).

Regarding to claim 4, Kraenzel and Behera teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, Behera further discloses the step of ***establishing pre-determined rules in the centralized database based on at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines; and establishing methodology to ensure timely and accurate decision making based on criteria established by the management*** (Behera, Col. 4, lines 26-55).

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879], CERN [Administrative Information Services, Oracle HR] and Lillibridge [USP 6,195,698 B1].

Regarding to claim 2, Kraenzel and Behera teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose the step of ***creating an electronic profile based on information available from at least one an OHR Application and an RFCA Application***. CERN teaches an OHR application and Lillibridge teaches an RFCA Application (Lillibridge, Col. 8, lines 35-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Behera method by using information from OHR Application and RFCA Application

to build the electronic profile in order to distribute object to a user or a group via IP address.

8. Claims 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Stockwell et al. [USP 5,950,195].

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 1, a profile compiling/updating object 32 may use the information received from user affinity determining object 30 to generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 2, lines 65-67) as the step of ***providing capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to***. To prevent access to objects containing, for example, confidential or proprietary information, users may be assigned levels of access privileges. Access privileges may be, for example, read-only, edit, etc. Access privileges may be assigned by a system administrator and stored in an access control list or ACL (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 18-26). As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum

requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user. If, however, step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), step 162 determines whether the user has requested additional privileges from the system administrator. If additional privileges have not been requested, step 164 notifies the user that access has been denied. Otherwise, step 166 determines if additional privileges have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, step 168 updates the ACL and may proceed to retrieve and present the requested object using steps 158 and 160 respectively. If step 166 determines that additional privileges have not been granted, the user may be notified that access has been denied using step 164 (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43). As seen, the technique as discussed indicates the steps of ***tracking a status of the request; obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested; implementing the decision; and notifying the user of the decision***. Kraenzel fails to teach ***a pre-determined time frame*** is set up when notifying the user. Stockwell teaches a pre-determined time frame could be configured in an ACL for a connection (Stockwell, Col. 9, line 60-Col. 10, line 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by including a pre-determined time frame in the ACL in order to keep track a transaction in a client/server system.

Regarding to claim 6, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***obtaining at least one of an approval decision and a disapproval decision*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 7, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***reviewing and auditing the user access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 8, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating a consistent security model that includes centralized administration of security of the system and uses single user profile and privilege for accessing different applications*** (Col. 3, lines 1-15; Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 9, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating user profiles; providing access control to data associated with user profiles; defining permissions based on a user identifier associated with user profiles; and developing a specification for user interfaces*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, line 1-Col. 4, line 13).

Regarding to claim 10, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step ***providing***

administration of a common security model for access control and event notification (Kraenzel, FIG. 3).

Regarding to claim 11, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***updating profiles automatically on at least one of a pre-determined timed interval and a change in organization hierarchy*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42).

Regarding to claim 12, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel and Stockwell does not teach the step of ***updating profiles automatically when a user transfers departments***. However, as disclosed by Kraenzel, profile system 14 may automatically update a user's profile by periodically checking the ACL of the network. This may be performed on a routine basis, or on a random basis, when requested by a system administrator, or at various other instances. System 14 may also use the above process for updating a user profile by simply adding supplemental information to the user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42). Thus, when a user transfers departments, system administrator updates the ACL, and user profile will be updated automatically. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Stockwell method by including the step of updating profiles when a user transfers department in order to control access to a database.

Regarding to claim 13, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***generating access list reports that identify accessible and non-accessible data and restrictions for access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 20-26 and Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding to claim 14, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***retrieving information from the centralized database in response to a specific inquiry from an administrator*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding to claim 15, Kraenzel and Stockwell teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 5, Stockwell further discloses ***the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet*** (Stockwell, Col. 4, lines 21-28).

9. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behera [USP 6,535,879] in view of Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039 B1].

Regarding to claim 16, Behera teaches a LDAP as a database configured to be protected from access by using Access Control List or ACL. The Directory Server Administrator creates basic ACL rules that grant specific users access to certain information in the directory (Behera, Col. 3, lines 9-37). Behera further discloses the

ACL rules that comprises ***data corresponding to at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines; data corresponding to applications that cross-references the applications data against unique identifiers; data corresponding to users that cross-references the users data against unique identifiers*** (Behara, Col. 4, lines 38-55). Although the directory server matches the desired attributes within the specified attribute fieldname with the user's attributes for allowing access to the directory entry only if the user has the desired attribute values. Behera fails to teach ***data corresponding to various methodologies that facilitates accurate decision making***. Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user. If, however, step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), step 162 determines whether the user has requested additional privileges from the system

administrator. If additional privileges have not been requested, step 164 notifies the user that access has been denied. Otherwise, step 166 determines if additional privileges have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, step 168 updates the ACL and may proceed to retrieve and present the requested object using steps 158 and 160 respectively. If step 166 determines that additional privileges have not been granted, the user may be notified that access has been denied using step 164 (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object of FIG. 3 as ***various methodologies that facilitates accurate decision making***, the retrieved object and notified data are data corresponding to ***various methodologies***. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Behera technique by using the method of access as taught by Kraenzel in order to process an access request of a user.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q PHAM whose telephone number is 703-605-4242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KIM Y VU can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Examiner Hung Pham
September 29, 2003

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100